




Cincinnati Bar
ASSOCIATION

2023 JUDICIAL CANDIDATE POLL RESULTS



Ahead of each Election Day, the Cincinnati Bar Association sends a confidential, nonpartisan Judicial Survey of the candidates for election to all active attorney members. Members respond only to questions about candidates with whom they have had contact in the past four years, rating candidates on 6 categories.



Administrative Diligence

Candidate has the ability to run a courtroom in an efficient manner that leads to a timely disposition of matters before the court.



Communication Skills

Candidate communicates in a clear and respectful manner that demonstrates respect for the judicial process.




Community Engagement

Candidate is engaged in meaningful efforts to improve our community.



Integrity/Impartiality/ Objectivity

Candidate strives to administer justice in an impartial manner free of explicit or implicit bias.



Legal Experience

Candidate possesses the appropriate knowledge, skillsets, and experience specific to the judicial seat being sought.



Professionalism/Temperament


Candidate has demonstrated professionalism, ethics, and civility towards attorneys and non-attorneys regardless of what role they play in the judicial process, their political affiliation, and social standing.

This year, we received 169 responses for the eight Municipal Court candidates spread across seven districts. The candidates are: Janaya Trotter Bratton (District 1); Donte Johnson (District 2); William Mallory (District 3); Curtis Kissinger (District 4); Samantha Silverstein (District 4); Brad Greenberg (District 5); Bernard Bouchard (District 6); and Jacqueline Ginocchio (District 8). Their ratings percentages in each of the six categories can be found on the following pages. For a copy of the complete results, visit www.cincybar.org/judicialsurvey.


■ Excellent
 ■ Above AVG
 ■ Average
 ■ Below AVG
 ■ Unknown

Shown in percentages


JANAYA TROTTER BRATTON / DISTRICT 1




DONTE JOHNSON / DISTRICT 2



WILLIAM L. MALLORY / DISTRICT 3




CURTIS E. KISSINGER / DISTRICT 4




■ Excellent
 ■ Above AVG
 ■ Average
 ■ Below AVG
 ■ Unknown

Shown in percentages


SAMANTHA SILVERSTEIN / DISTRICT 4




BRAD J. GREENBERG / DISTRICT 5



BERNARD A. BOUCHARD / DISTRICT 6



JACQUELINE M. GINOCCHIO / DISTRICT 7



**Judicial Candidate Poll Results
"October 2023"**

The following is the Cincinnati Bar Association's 2023 Hamilton County Judicial Candidate Poll. The survey was distributed to 2705 members of the Cincinnati legal community and provides valuable insights and observations about the local judicial candidates from members of the legal community that interact with them professionally.

			Administrative Diligence		Communication Skills		Community Engagement		Integrity / Impartiality / Objectivity		Legal Experience		Professionalism / Temperament	
			Responded	%	Responded	%	Responded	%	Responded	%	Responded	%	Responded	%
Janaya Trotter Bratton														
Total Responses	169		45	51%	55	63%	55	63%	51	58%	50	57%	54	61%
With Contact	88	Excellent	27	31%	21	24%	10	11%	23	26%	22	25%	16	18%
% With Contact	52%	Above AVG	7	8%	9	10%	9	10%	6	7%	11	13%	9	10%
No Contact	81	Average	5	6%	3	3%	1	1%	8	9%	3	3%	8	9%
% No Contact	48%	Below AVG	4	5%	0	0%	13	15%	0	0%	2	2%	1	1%
			Unknown											
Donte Johnson														
Total Responses	169		38	52%	42	58%	29	40%	45	62%	37	51%	51	70%
With Contact	73	Excellent	20	27%	21	29%	13	18%	20	27%	20	27%	16	22%
% With Contact	43%	Above AVG	8	11%	10	14%	7	10%	6	8%	10	14%	5	7%
No Contact	96	Average	1	1%	0	0%	3	4%	2	3%	2	3%	1	1%
% No Contact	57%	Below AVG	6	8%	0	0%	21	29%	0	0%	4	5%	0	0%
			Unknown											
William L. Mallory														
Total Responses	169		39	38%	40	39%	29	28%	34	33%	53	52%	22	22%
With Contact	102	Excellent	31	30%	28	27%	15	15%	28	27%	32	31%	25	25%
% With Contact	60%	Above AVG	23	23%	24	24%	16	16%	22	22%	15	15%	20	20%
No Contact	67	Average	7	7%	10	10%	6	6%	17	17%	1	1%	35	34%
% No Contact	40%	Below AVG	2	2%	0	0%	36	35%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
			Unknown											
Curtis E. Kissinger														
Total Responses	169		63	62%	61	60%	39	38%	55	54%	60	59%	70	69%
With Contact	102	Excellent	21	21%	26	25%	13	13%	12	12%	23	23%	23	23%
% With Contact	60%	Above AVG	12	12%	14	14%	17	17%	19	19%	12	12%	6	6%
No Contact	67	Average	3	3%	1	1%	5	5%	15	15%	3	3%	2	2%
% No Contact	40%	Below AVG	3	3%	0	0%	28	27%	1	1%	4	4%	1	1%
			Unknown											
Samantha Silverstein														
Total Responses	169		40	54%	50	68%	48	65%	44	59%	41	55%	46	62%
With Contact	74	Excellent	4	5%	7	9%	9	12%	10	14%	13	18%	11	15%
% With Contact	44%	Above AVG	9	12%	9	12%	6	8%	5	7%	6	8%	7	9%
No Contact	95	Average	5	7%	7	9%	2	3%	11	15%	12	16%	9	12%
% No Contact	56%	Below AVG	16	22%	1	1%	9	12%	4	5%	2	3%	1	1%
			Unknown											
Brad J. Greenberg														
Total Responses	169		63	66%	52	55%	37	39%	53	56%	61	64%	65	68%
With Contact	95	Excellent	16	17%	29	31%	17	18%	22	23%	21	22%	24	25%
% With Contact	56%	Above AVG	14	15%	13	14%	12	13%	15	16%	7	7%	5	5%
No Contact	74	Average	1	1%	1	1%	5	5%	5	5%	2	2%	1	1%
% No Contact	44%	Below AVG	1	1%	0	0%	24	25%	0	0%	4	4%	0	0%
			Unknown											
Bernard A. Bouchard														
Total Responses	169		30	34%	34	39%	21	24%	29	33%	35	40%	32	37%
With Contact	87	Excellent	25	29%	18	21%	6	7%	18	21%	25	29%	15	17%
% With Contact	51%	Above AVG	21	24%	22	25%	16	18%	17	20%	16	18%	19	22%
No Contact	82	Average	10	11%	12	14%	15	17%	22	25%	6	7%	21	24%
% No Contact	49%	Below AVG	1	1%	1	1%	29	33%	1	1%	5	6%	0	0%
			Unknown											
Jacqueline M. Ginocchio														
Total Responses	169		29	40%	33	45%	22	30%	32	44%	28	38%	27	37%
With Contact	73	Excellent	19	26%	17	23%	6	8%	13	18%	17	23%	17	23%
% With Contact	43%	Above AVG	17	23%	20	27%	11	15%	20	27%	19	26%	21	29%
No Contact	96	Average	7	10%	3	4%	7	10%	8	11%	5	7%	8	11%
% No Contact	57%	Below AVG	1	1%	0	0%	27	37%	0	0%	4	5%	0	0%
			Unknown											

Margin of Error = +/- 4%